ALLTEL Corporate Services, Inc.

655 15th Street N.W. Suite 220 V/ashington, DC 20005 202-783-3970 202-783-3982 fax



June 26, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary	7
Federal Communications Commission	
1919 M Street, N .W., Room 222	
Washington, DC 20554	

RECEIVED

JUN 2 6 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS CLIMINISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of

CC Docket No. 96-115
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Mr. Caton:

Enclosed are an original and six copies of the Reply Comments of ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation in the above-referenced proceeding.

Questions regarding these Reply Comments may be directed to me at the above address or by telephone at 202-783-3976.

Sincerely,

Glenn S Rahin

#### **Enclosures**

Janice Myles (Paper and disk copy)
International Transcription Services, Inc.

# Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUN 2 6 1996

In the Matter of OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Implementation of the OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Implementation of the OFFICE OF SECRETARY

CC Docket No. 96-115

Telecommunications Carrier's Use Of Customer Proprietary Network Office OF SECRETARY

CC Docket No. 96-115

Telecommunications Carrier's Use Office OF SECRETARY

Information and Other Customer Office OF SECRETARY

## REPLY COMMENTS OF ALLTEL Telephone Service Corporation

Glenn S. Rabin Federal Regulatory Counsel

ALLTEL Corporate Services, Inc. 655 15th Street, N.W. Suite 220 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-3976

Dated: June 26, 1996

No. of Copies rec'd C + C List A B C D E

#### **SUMMARY**

ALLTEL continues to argue for a broad interpretation of the term

"telecommunications services" for purposes of Section 222 of the 1996 Act in order to permit
a single carrier to provide subscribers with integrated services. Further, ALLTEL believes
that the privacy concerns of subscribers and their needs for integrated telecommunications
service offerings are best balanced by requiring written authorizations only for the disclosure
of CPNI information to third parties. Further, where the subscriber has been provided with
written notice of their CPNI rights, a carrier may infer an existing subscriber's consent to the
carrier's use of CPNI until otherwise notified by the subscriber.

With respect to competitive concerns arising from the use of CPNI, ALLTEL notes, as do a number of other carriers, that there is support for, at a minimum, relieving small carriers of any subscriber authorization requirement imposed by the Commission. These carriers do not generally exercise market power in their local exchange territories.

ALLTEL argues that new Section 222(e) of the Communications Act does not require the Commission to promulgate new and detailed rules governing the provision of subscriber list information. Rather, the reasonable and non-discriminatory standards set forth in Section 222(e) should govern the provision of this information.

## Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

	:JUN 2 6 1996
In the Matter of	) FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIO ) OFFICE OF SECRETARY
Implementation of the	)
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)
	) CC Docket No. 96-115
Telecommunications Carrier's Use	<i>)</i> )
of Customer Proprietary Network	)
Information and Other Customer	)
Information	)

### **REPLY COMMENTS OF ALLTEL Telephone Service Corporation**

ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation ("ALLTEL") hereby submits its reply comments in the above-captioned matter. In support thereof, the following is respectfully set forth.

In its comments, ALLTEL noted that small, independent local exchange carriers are ill-equipped to shoulder the technical, organizational and financial challenges which may result from the imposition of new and broad-reaching CPNI requirements. A number of diverse parties agreed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See in this connection the Comments of USTA at pages 3-4; Comments of MFS Communications Company ("MFS") at pages 2-8;

ALLTEL's comments also echoed the sentiments of numerous parties suggesting that the Commission adopt a broad reading of the term "telecommunications services" for purposes of Section 222 of the 1996 Act <sup>2</sup> and that the Commission require written authorizations only for CPNI disclosures to third parties. SBC Communications agreed that, where the customer receives written notification of their CPNI rights, carriers may infer an existing subscriber's consent to the carrier's use of CPNI unless the subscriber otherwise notifies the carrier. Many parties, including ALLTEL, opposed any requirement for notice of the availability of aggregate CPNI, or the imposition of detailed rules to implement the subscriber list provision of Section 222(e) of the 1996 Act. 6

ALLTEL acknowledged at page 2 of its comments that the Commission must strike the appropriate balance among customers' privacy interests, the competitive equities of the new and emerging telecommunications markets and the efficiency with which all carriers, and particularly non-BOC LECs, are permitted to provide broad, integrated telecommunications services. As summarized by BellSouth, any rules adopted by the Commission should: 1) reflect reasonable customer expectations of CPNI use by carriers with whom the customer has an existing relationship; 2) minimize customer confusion; and 3)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Comments of USTA at pages 2-3; Comments of MFS at pages 3-5; Comments of SBC Communications at pages 5-10; Comments of Cincinnati Bell Telephone at pages 3-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See, for example, Comments of Cincinnati Bell Telephone at page 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Comments of SBC Communications at page 10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See, for example, Comments of SBC Communications at page 13;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Comments of USTA at pages 6-7; Comments of SBC Communications at page 15.

facilitate customers' desires for one-stop shopping.7

In purported defense of a competitive market place, however, a number of parties suggested that all incumbent LECs be hamstrung with detailed notification and written customer authorization requirements in order to use CPNI to market integrated telecommunications service offerings. ALLTEL strenuously disagrees and notes, as it did in its comments at page 2, that Congress acknowledged the different competitive status of those local exchange carriers with less than 2% of the nation's access lines. The Commission recognized this difference as well when it tentatively concluded not to extend pre-existing CPNI rules to carriers other than AT&T, GTE and the Bell Operating Companies. (NPRM at para. 3)

Other carriers noted the inability of new entrants and companies with less than 2% of the nations access lines to engage in anticompetitive conduct on the basis of CPNI. MFS, through analogy to the joint marketing restrictions of Section 271(e)(1) of the Act, suggests that the Commission should permit carriers with less than 5% of the nation's presubscribed lines to cross-market customers with CPNI without prior customer authorization. AirTouch, which favors the imposition of detailed CPNI authorization requirements on LECs, acknowledges that both the Congress and the Commission have distinguished the competitive status of small and mid-sized LECs and notes that the proposed CPNI requirements for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Comments of Bell South at page i.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See, for example, Comments of the Competitive Telecommunications Association at page 10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Comments of MFS at page 10.

written authorizations may not be appropriate for these companies. 10 LDDS apparently draws a distinction between the market power of dominant incumbent LECs (such as the BOCs and GTE) and other incumbent LECs. It argues for more restrictive CPNI rules only for the RBOCs. 11 There is support, therefore, for tailoring any CPNI notification or authorization rules to the size of the carrier. ALLTEL believes that, at a minimum, an exemption from written authorization requirements for existing customers represents the type of distinction the Commission may provide for smaller LECs.

With respect to subscriber list information under Section 222(e), ALLTEL fully concurs with the comments submitted in this proceeding by the Yellow Pages Publisher's Association. The Act does not set forth any requirement for specific rules, let alone standards for national, uniform pricing. As a producer of directories for a number of independent LECs other than the ALLTEL telephone companies, ALLTEL is keenly aware that the costs associated with obtaining and maintaining subscriber list information vary enormously among different telephone companies. No pricing standard other than the "reasonable and non-discriminatory" standard set forth in the Act should be adopted.

Nor does the Act mandate the other specific requirements advocated by ADP and others, such as incremental cost pricing, specific time frames for the availability of subscriber list information and updates, or formats. Rather, Section 222(e) proposes a standard of non-discrimination -- telephone companies must only supply subscriber list

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Comments of AirTouch Communications, Inc. at fn.8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Comments of LDDS WORLDCOM at pages 3-5, 11-12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Comments of the Association of Directory Publishers ("ADP") at page 13.

information to independent publishers on the same terms and conditions as it is supplied to the affiliated publisher. Any departure from this standard may be policed by the Commission under the Section 208 complaint process.

Respectfully submitted,

ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation

Glenn S. Rabin

Federal Regulatory Counsel

ALLTEL Corporate Services. Inc. 655 15th Street, N.W. Suite 220 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-3976

Dated: June 26, 1996

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Sondra T. Spottswood, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments of ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation" was mailed this 25th day of June, 1996, via U.S. mail, first-class, postage prepaid, to the following, unless otherwise noted:

Sondra T. Spottswoo

Regina Keeney, Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554
(hand delivered)

Janice Myles
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544
Washington, D.C. 20554
(hand delivered) (with diskette)

International Transcription Services 2100 M Street, N.W. Suite 140 Washington, D.C. 20037 (hand delivered)

Jack B. Harrison, Esquire Frost & Jacobs Attorneys for Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company 2500 PNC Center 201 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Michael J. Shortley, III, Esquire Attorney for Frontier Corporation 180 South Clinton Avenue Rochester, New York 14646

Albert H. Kramer, Esquire Robert F. Aldrich, Esquire Attorneys for IntelCom Group (U.S.A.), Inc. Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, L.L.P. 2101 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

David A. Gross Kathleen Q. Abernathy AirTouch Communications, Inc. 1818 N Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20004-2404 Catherine R. Sloan
Richard L. Fruchterman, Esquire
Richard S. Whitt, Esquire
Worldcom, Inc.
d/b/a LDDS WorldCom
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Charles C. Hunter, Esquire Hunter & Row, P.C. 1620 I Street, N.W. Suite 701 Washington, D.C. 20006

James D. Ellis, Esquire Robert M. Lynch, Esquire David F. Brown, Esquire SBC Communications, Inc. 175 E. Houston, Room 1254 San Antonio, Texas 78205

Bradley Stillman, Esquire Counsel for Consumer Federation of America 1424 16th Street, N.W. Suite 604 Washington, D.C. 20036

Frank W. Krogh, Esquire Donald J. Elardo MCI Telecommunications Corporation 1801 Pennsylvania Avenue., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Andrew D. Lipman, Esquire
Mark Sievers, Esquire
Swidler & Berlin, Chartered
MFS Communications Company, Inc.
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007

Randolph J. May, Esquire Sutherland, Ashbill & Brennan Compuserve Incorporated 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-2404 William B. Barfield, Esquire M. Robert Sutherland, Esquire BellSouth Corporation Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.

Mary McDermott, Esquire
Linda Kent, Esquire
Charles D. Cosson, Esquire
Keith Towsend, Esquire
United States Telephone Association
1401 H Street, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005

Albert Halprin, Esquire
Joel Bernstein, Esquire
Attorneys for the Yellow Pages
Publishers Association
Halprin, Temple, Goodman and Sugrue
100 New York Avenue, N.W.. Suite 650E
Washington, D.C. 20005

Theodore Case Whitehouse, Esquire Michael F. Finn, Esquire Wilkie, Farr & Gallagher The Association of Director Publishers Three Lafayette Centre 1155 21st Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-3384

Charles H. Helein, General Counsel Helein & Associates, P.C. America's Carrier's Telecommunications Association 8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700 McLean, VA 22102

Phillip F. McClelland Assistant Consumer Advocate Irwin A. Popowsky Consumer Advocate Office of Attorney General Office of Consumer Advocate 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120 Assemblyman Anthony J. Genovesi New York State Assemblyman Legislative Office Building Room 456 Albany, New York 12248-0001

Danny E. Adams, Esquire Steven A. Augustino, Esquire Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20036

Carl W. Northrop, Esquire Christine M. Crowe, Esquire Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., 10th Floor Washington, D.C. 20004-2400

Mary Mack Adu, Esquire
Peter Arth, Jr., Esquire
Edward W. O'Neill, Esquire
Attorneys for the People of the State of
California and the Public Utilities
Commission of the State of California
505 VanNess Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Kathryn Marie Krause, Esquire Attorney for U S West, Inc. Suite 700 1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Margaret E. Garber, Esquire Attorney for Pacific Telesis Group 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004

Lucille M. Mates, Esquire
Sarah R. Thomas, Esquire
Patrick L.C. Mahoney, Esquire
Attorneys for Pacific Telesis Group
140 New Montgomery Street, Room 1522A
San Francisco, CA 94105

Mark J. Golden, Esquire Vice President of Industry Affairs Personal Communications Industry Association 500 Montgomery Street Suite 700 Alexandria, VA 22314-1561

Saul Fisher, Esquire Thomas J. Farrelly, Esquire Attorneys for NYNEX Telephone Companies 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036

David J. Gudino, Esquire GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036

Joseph P. Markoski, Esquire Marc Berejka, Esquire Squire, Sanders & Dempsey Technology Association of America 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20044

Jay C. Keithley, Esquire Leon M. Kestenbaum, Esquire Norina T. Moy, Esquire Sprint Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20036

Albert H. Kramer, Esquire Robert F. Aldrich, Esquire American Public Communications Council Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, L.L.P. 2101 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20553 Jonathan E. Canis, Esquire Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay Virginia Islands Telephone Corporation 1301 K Street, N.W. Suite 1100 - East Tower Washington, D.C. 20005

Paul Rodgers, General Counsel National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners 1201 Constitution Avenue, Suite 1102 Post Office Box 684 Washington, D.C. 20044

Ann P. Morton, Esquire Cable & Wireless, Inc. 8219 Leesburg Pike Vienna, VA 22182

Alan N. Baker, Esquire Michael S. Pabian, Esquire Attorneys for Ameritech 2000 West Ameritech Center Drive Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

Lawrence W. Katz, Esquire
The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies
1320 North Court House Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Thomas K. Crowe, Esquire Law Offices of Thomas K. Krowe, P.C. Counsel for Excel Telecommunications, Inc. 2300 M Street, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20037

Jackie Follis, Senior Policy Analyst Office of Regulatory Affairs Public Utility Commission of Texas 7800 Shoal Creek Boulevard Austin, Texas 78757 Danny E. Adams, Esquire Steven A. Augustino, Esquire Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20036

Teresa Marrero, Esquire Senior Regulatory Counsel Teleport Communications Group, Inc. One Teleport Drive Suite 300 Staten Island, NY 10310 Mark C. Rosenblum, Esquire Leonard J. Cali, Esquire/Judy Sello Attorneys for AT&T Corp. Room 3244J1 295 North Maple Avenue Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920